






REVIEW

Morphological Markedness in the Holy Quran

Omar Abdullah Al-Haj Eid ^{1*} , Ashraf Waleed Mansour ² , Adnan Mahmoud Abumahfouz ³ ,
Amal AlNatour ⁴ , Ala Shdough ⁵, Ahmad Abu Jarrar ⁶ , Ali Al Kassab ⁷

¹ Linguistics-Faculty of Educational Sciences and Arts, UNRWA University, Amman 1118, Jordan

² French and English Department, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, Amman 1118, Jordan

³ English Department, Translation-Al-Balqa Applied University, Salt 19117, Jordan

⁴ English Department, Literature-Yarmouk University, Irbid 21110, Jordan

⁵ Arabic-General Education and Foundation Program, Rabdan Academy, Abu Dhabi 27272, UAE

⁶ Arabic-Faculty of Educational Sciences and Arts, UNRWA University, Amman 1118, Jordan

⁷ Education-Faculty of Educational Sciences and Arts, UNRWA University, Amman 1118, Jordan

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to examine the Quranic morphological markedness in 112 selected expressions as an important linguistic phenomenon. Adopting a descriptive-analytical method to investigate the corpus of the study, we collected 112 Quranic expressions. We analyzed them by classifying these expressions into morphologically unmarked and marked forms and examining their translations. The study revealed that Quranic morphological markedness enhances the expression of the verses' inimitability and eloquence. It emphasizes the role of marked forms—such as affixes—in imparting additional layers of meaning and highlighting Quranic depth and clarity of the Quranic messages. These morphological affixes allow for a specific interpretation of verses by permeating them with nuanced meaning. The paper also underlines the challenges faced by translators, who often render both unmarked and marked forms, similarly, potentially resulting in a loss of meaning or misinterpretation.

Keywords: the Holy Quran; Verses; Morphological Markedness; Marked; Unmarked

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Omar Abdullah Al-Haj Eid, Linguistics-Faculty of Educational Sciences and Arts/ UNRWA University, Amman 11118, Jordan ; Email: O.el-hajeid@unrwa.org

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 28 April 2025 | Revised: 25 May 2025 | Accepted: 30 May 2025 | Published Online: 5 September 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.9736>

CITATION

Eid, O.A.A.-H., Mansour, W., Abumahfouz, A.M., et al., 2025. Morphological Markedness in the Holy Quran. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(9): 384–401. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.9736>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Researchers have commonly used the term “markedness”. Broadly, this concept focuses on the difference between what is considered common, natural, neutral, or expected, and what deviates from these norms. The former is “unmarked,” and the latter is “marked.” Initially, it was introduced within the field of phonology and morphology. The traditional idea of markedness has since been extended to several other areas, including syntax, semantics, pragmatics, language acquisition, and other linguistic disciplines. Markedness was first presented in phonemics by Jakobson^[1] and has a variety of applications in syntax, morphology, phonology, semantics, pragmatics, and other linguistic disciplines. It is vital for understanding how languages encode distinctions like gender, number, tense, case, or aspect.^[2] Markedness highlights how languages differentiate meaning through structural complexity and provides a context for understanding linguistic differences and universals.

Several scholars have employed the term “markedness” as a key term in linguistics to refer to the difference between two forms: unmarked and marked in the morphological system of language^[1]. The marked form is seen by Trask^[3] as “less central or less natural than a countering one on different basics, such as less occurrence, more constrained distribution, more obvious morphological marking, greater semantic specificity, or greater rarity in languages generally”. The unmarked form usually refers to regular, common, basic, frequent, default, or normal, whereas the marked form often refers to irregular, less frequent, less common, or deviant.

Battistella^[4] argues that a morphologically unmarked one has a broader range of frequency and a more indefinite meaning than a morphologically marked form, for example, in English *cat/cats*. The singular ‘cat’ is unmarked, and “cats” is marked. In the Holy Quran, /استطاع/ is unmarked (more basic, common, and frequent), but /اسطاع/ is marked (less common and less frequent). Markedness can be employed at several levels of linguistics analysis, including syntax, phonology, semantics, and morphology.

Morphological markedness in Arabic is particularly relevant due to the presence of the inflectional nature of Arabic, characterized by various morphological forms that carry linguistic functions and nuanced meanings.

Morphological markedness in Arabic usually involves alterations in the structure of the word, such as deleting, adding letters, shifting patterns, or changing vowels, which result in nuanced meanings or enhanced semantic depth.

The Quranic verses are valuable for their divine guidance and are investigated for their linguistic originality. Abu Mahfouz^[5] states that Arabic in which the Holy Quran was revealed displays an intricate system of affixes, roots, stems, bases, and patterns that produce layers of meaning. Within this context, morphological markedness plays a significant part in understanding how specific forms are employed to convey certain senses or prominences, that could meaningfully impact interpretation.

The Holy Quran is abundant in linguistic details going beyond usual communication. More specifically, the rich morphological system in Arabic offers a fertile ground for examining markedness, particularly when applied to Quranic verses^[6]. The Holy Quran shows unique morphological structures that are not arbitrary. They are precisely constructed to express layers of meaning and convey moral, theological, and precise contextual nuances. Morphological markedness in the Quranic verses can be apparent through two different morphological forms: singular versus plural, active versus passive, masculine versus feminine, and diminutive versus standard noun forms. The marked forms are employed purposely to express precise meanings or to realize rhetorical purposes.

Linguists and Arabic interpreters of the Holy Quran have discussed the implications of unmarked and marked forms. They have examined how the markedness interacts with the syntactic, phonological, and semantic features of the Holy Quran. Morphological markedness in Quranic verses reflects nuanced meanings, aesthetic, stylistic qualities, and functional effectiveness.

The study offers valuable insights into the interaction between meaning and language, helping us understand the aesthetics, eloquence, stylistics, and exactness of Quranic verses. This paper attempts to deepen our awareness of Quran’s linguistic knowledge by examining the use of morphological markedness and crystallizing its eloquence.

This research explores how the morphological markedness of unmarked and marked forms in Quranic verses impacts language through derivation. The motivation arose from the current researchers’ observation that many un-

marked and marked forms occur in Quranic verses, along with the dearth of the related studies. Morphological markedness has been partially neglected, and several English language learners are unfamiliar with morphological unmarked and marked forms in Quranic verses. To the researchers' best knowledge, no paper has been exclusively devoted to Quranic morphological markedness. Therefore, this phenomenon has proved to be a new hot spot of examination. Moreover, this study draws its importance from the novelty of its topic, making it distinct from other research studies since no papers have been conducted on morphological markedness in the Holy Quran. It is a novel contribution to the study of morphological markedness of unmarked and marked forms in general, and to a better understanding of Quranic verses in particular. It is also a significant attempt to enhance researchers' knowledge of morphological markedness in the context of Quranic verses, their implications, and their translation for learners of English. Accordingly, it attempts to fill this gap in the literature by addressing the following questions:

1.1. Research Questions

1. How do unmarked and marked morphological forms manifest in Quranic verses?
2. Do unmarked and marked forms in Quranic verses affect the meanings of certain verses?
3. How do these forms affect the translation and interpretation of Quranic texts?

1.2. Research Objectives

The current study is meant to:

1. Investigate the morphological markedness in Quranic verses.
2. Analyze selected morphological samples of unmarked and marked forms in Quranic verses.
3. Investigate translating unmarked and marked forms in Quranic verses.

2. Markedness and Translation

Markedness sheds light on the slight but important variances and nuances in meaning in selected verses of the Holy Quran. Generally speaking, translation is an academic

project that conveys meaning from a source language into a target language. However, there is more to the translation process than just transferring the meaning, as translation is not a straightforward process and meaning is not always transparent. As a fuzzy concept, language sometimes makes the translator's mission even impossible simply because there is no one-to-one correspondence between languages, and referential gaps pose a common problem for translators. Further, authoritative texts like the Holy Quran need careful handling because they are special. Abdul-Raof ^[7] suggests that the postulate of Quranic untranslatability is explained and substantiated by Quranic examples at linguistic, rhetorical, micro, and macro levels; subtle linguistic and complex rhetorical problems remain resistant translation.

Abumahfouz and Shboul ^[8] argue that, due to the very nature of the Holy Quran which resolutely makes a special case of linguistic inimitability, translators of the meanings of the Quranic discourse have almost always remained that their ultimate aim is not to reproduce the original text flawlessly, rather, to approximate the idea or meaning to the reader. This, among other ideological issues, led Muslim scholars to insist that the concept of "Quran translation" be altogether rejected. Further, the endeavor in this respect is to convey "the meanings" of the Holy Quran, not the Quran itself.

It remains to be said that morphological markedness, as the researchers see it, refers to any modification at the word level that necessitates a minor or major change in meaning. This phenomenon should be accentuated in translating the meanings of the Holy Quran

3. Markedness Criteria

Several linguists investigated the features of unmarked and marked forms and the criteria used to differentiate between the two forms. For instance, Levinson ^[9] stated that marked forms are morphologically complex, periphrastic, less neutral, and less frequent in usage. Additionally, many researchers have examined the criteria for evaluating markedness. Fleischman ^[10] indicated that the criteria for assigning markedness principles can be morphological, semantic, and/or contextual and are independent. The following are features of markedness, and this study seeks to utilize them to assess and distinguish between marked and

unmarked forms. It also seeks to use these characteristics to analyze and evaluate the two forms.

3.1. Predictability

Hume^[11] underlines the significance of predictability in differentiating between unmarked and marked forms. Unmarked forms are much more predictable and widely distributed. Lee^[12] links markedness to readers' expectations, observing that marked forms deviate from what is predicted, though grammatically correct, and confirms the association between markedness and predictability.

3.2. Informativity

Informativity is a major feature of markedness and regards marked forms as more informative than unmarked forms. Winter^[13] proposes that marked forms convey a complex informational weight and are considered essential to all markedness forms stating that marked forms display more information due to their restricted specificity, distribution, or complexity^[14].

3.3. Frequency

Winter^[13] considers frequency as the main factor defining markedness, treating the two forms as equivalent through a statistical lens. But Henning Andersen and other researchers challenge this viewpoint, declaring that markedness could not be merely resolved by frequency. Although frequency is important, it varies across languages and is shaped by factors beyond meaning. Winter^[13] highlights that markedness is tied to productivity, complexity, informativity, and structures. For instance, phrases like "court martial" in English reveal marked forms because of their uncommon word order, making them less productive. Accordingly, markedness is formed by several factors, not just frequency.

3.4. Complexity

Complexity and frequency are thoroughly associated with defining markedness. John Haiman argues that frequency takes priority over complexity, observing that even correspondingly complex words, like "mare" and "female hippo," vary in markedness because of frequency. Winter

^[13] emphasizes that more complex elements tend to happen less frequently than simpler, unmarked forms. Edith Moravcsik emphasizes that grammatical complexity—encompassing, syntax, meaning, morphology, and phonology—is vital to markedness. Winter^[13] notes that marked forms are frequently morphologically and semantically complex, nevertheless not all complex forms are marked.

3.5. Specification

Roman Jakobson introduced the notion of specification by extending Trubetzkoy's marking concept to grammatical and lexical meanings. For instance, in Russian, the word "oslica" (female donkey) is marked as it specifies gender, while "osel" (male donkey) is unmarked and lacks this specificity classifies specification as an essential principle of semantic markedness^[1], utilizing the difference between "dog" (unmarked because of its common use) and "bitch" (marked because of its semantic precision). Fleischman^[10] mentions that the specificity of marked classes leads to features such as lower frequency and less contextual usage in comparison to unmarked classes.

This shows that a marked form does not need to have all the criteria of markedness. This point is primarily central to the present study, particularly when considering the application of these criteria to morphological markedness.

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Data Collection

The study adopted a descriptive-analytical method to examine morphological markedness in the Holy Quran and to identify the differences between unmarked and marked forms. The research was based on Jakobson's^[1] theory of morphological markedness. This method is principally suitable for exploring Quranic morphological markedness as it permits a thorough investigation of how morphological unmarked and marked forms are utilized in Quranic verses.

To collect the study data, the researchers documented selected samples of marked and unmarked forms of Quranic verses by concentrating on precise morphological features such as root patterns and affixation. The study also drew on Sibawayh's theory of Arabic morphology to examine how morphological markedness in the Holy Quran

contributes to understanding Quranic texts.

4.2. Data analysis

After collecting the study data, the researchers identified 112 Quranic expressions. These Quranic expressions were categorized into marked and unmarked forms, according to Quranic surahs and verses in which they appeared. To confirm the accuracy of the data, the researchers consulted a jury panel of four professors from the Faculty of Educational Sciences and Arts experts in Arabic and Quranic interpretation. These panels meticulously examined the morphologically unmarked and marked forms and their assigned translation, solving ambiguities and confirming the findings. The researchers resorted to the interpretations of the Holy Quran such as Ibn Katheer ^[15], and Ibn Ashur ^[16] as well as five translators ^[17–19], Abdel Haleem ^[20], and Hilali and Khan ^[21]. The researchers sorted out the most agreed-upon forms, which always corresponded with the researchers' judgments. The Quranic verses containing morphological markedness were analyzed, with the forms were extracted and classified into unmarked and marked forms to explore their implications of Quranic interpretation.

4.3. Translation Critique: Systematic Comparative Analysis

It has been observed that translators often render unmarked and marked forms, similarly, potentially leading to meaning loss. The researchers systematized this observation through a detailed comparative analysis of the selected Quranic expressions across multiple established English translations.

The analysis included a consistent set of widely recognized English translations of the Holy Quran (e.g., Hilali & Khan, Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Pickthall, Arberry, Abdel Hal-eem), and included others where relevant to ensure a representative sample of interpretive approaches.

Case-by-Case Analysis of Marked Forms: For each identified instance of morphological markedness in our corpus (e.g., *استطاعوا/استطاعوا، النبيين/الأنبياء*, and instances of morphological addition/omission), systematically compared how each chosen translator handles the marked and unmarked pair.

Identification of Translation Strategies: The research-

ers categorized the translation strategies employed by each translator for these specific marked forms, including:

- **Literal Equivalence:** Attempting to mirror the morphological change directly.
- **Lexical Compensation:** Using different English words or phrases to convey the nuance (as seen in Hilali & Khan's "unable" vs. "could not").
- **Explanatory Additions:** Inserting explanatory notes or parenthetical information to clarify the markedness.
- **Neutralization/Homogenization:** Rendering both marked and unmarked forms identically, thus losing the distinction.
- **Dynamic Equivalence/Functional Equivalence:** Prioritizing the impact on the target audience over literal form.

Assessment of Meaning Preservation/Loss: For each strategy, the researchers critically assessed the extent to which the nuanced meaning, rhetorical purpose, or emphasis conveyed by the original Arabic morphological markedness is preserved or lost in the English translation. This involved cross-referencing with classical Arabic exegesis (e.g., Ibn Katheer, Ibn Ashur) to firmly ground our interpretive claims.

Identification of Patterns: Through this systematic comparison, the researchers identified recurring patterns and challenges faced by translators when rendering morphological markedness in the Quran.

5. Literature Review

5.1. Overview

Markedness was first introduced by the Prague School of Linguistics, pioneered by Trubetzkoy ^[22] and Jakobson ^[1]. The concept has been widely discussed in linguistics since then. The main premise of markedness is the binary opposition of linguistic entities (e.g., lion vs. lioness), where one member of the pair is distributionally more common both within a given language and cross-linguistically. Haspelmath ^[23] argues that the term "markedness" has developed a multiplicity of sometimes widely diverging senses of which many linguists are unaware. Further, he suggests that 'markedness' has lost its association with a particular theoretical approach and became established as an almost theory-neutral everyday term in linguistics. This,

however, opens the door to the inclusion of a wider variety of texts and linguistic phenomena within the framework of markedness, including morphological markedness in authoritative and religious texts such as the Holy Quran.

According to Haspelmath ^[23], “markedness” is a polysemous term in linguistics. The various senses with which it is used are connected through their historical origins (in Trubetzkoy ^[22] and Jakobson’s works ^[11]) and, synchronically, through family resemblances. However, most linguists who employ the terms “marked/unmarked” use them only in one or a subset of the various senses, and often they do not seem to be aware that the other senses exist, or that the differences between the senses can be dramatic. Suastini ^[22] suggests that markedness refers to how words are changed or augmented to convey a special meaning.

Moreover, Wälchli ^[25] argues that morphological markedness is different from other kinds of markedness in that it involves deviations from the norm. Such deviations function of attracting the audience’s attention and apply to specific positions in a text (and discourse) or, in an extended sense, to certain kinds of contexts. Marked expressions or constructions are ways of expression that are unusual in a given context; such deviations are crucial for structuring a text into more important (foregrounded) and less important (backgrounded) passages. Further, Haspelmath ^[23] considers morphological markedness a rarity in texts.

Cantarino ^[26] discussing Arabic sentence structure, argues that marked word order is intended “to give the predicate an emphatic effect” in nominal sentences and “to achieve an emphatic effect upon the subject” in verbal sentences. Elimam ^[27] puts forward that word order in Arabic is largely a matter of stylistic consideration and is available as a resource to achieve thematic progression, signal emphasis, focus, and contrast, and it should be considered in translation since variation in word order variety has a specific stylistic purpose and can have an effect on meaning ^[28,29].

The concept of markedness has been a pivotal theoretical construct in linguistics, offering insights into how languages encode meaning and make distinctions. This section traces its origins, explores its diverse applications, and contextualizes its relevance to Arabic linguistics and the translation of the Holy Quran.

5.2. The Genesis and Evolution of Markedness Theory

The term “**markedness**” was first introduced by the Prague School of Linguistics, spearheaded by pioneering figures like Nicholas Trubetzkoy ^[22] and Roman Jakobson ^[11]. Initially conceived within the field of phonology, markedness fundamentally rests on the principle of binary opposition between linguistic entities, where one form is considered the “unmarked” or default, representing the common, natural, or expected norm, while its counterpart is “marked,” deviating from this norm. For instance, in phonemics, Jakobson ^[11] identified distinctions such as voiced/voiceless consonants, where one member of the pair is more common or less complex.

From its initial application in phonology and morphology, the traditional idea of markedness has since expanded into several other linguistic disciplines. Its principles are now vital for understanding how languages encode distinctions across syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and even language acquisition. Scholars such as Trask ^[3] extended the concept, defining a marked form as less central or less natural than its counterpart on various bases, such as lower frequency, more constrained distribution, more overt morphological marking, greater semantic specificity, or greater rarity in languages. Similarly, Battistella ^[4] argues that a morphologically unmarked element typically possesses a broader range of frequencies and a more indefinite meaning compared to a morphologically marked one, as exemplified by the English singular ‘cat’ (unmarked) versus plural ‘cats’ (marked). In the Holy Quran, for instance, /استطاع/ is frequently observed and thus considered unmarked, whereas /اسطاع/ is less common, rendering it marked.

Despite its wide application, the term “markedness” has developed a polysemous nature, acquiring a multiplicity of sometimes widely diverging senses, as noted by Haspelmath ^[23]. He suggests that ‘markedness’ has lost its strict association with any particular theoretical approach, becoming an “theory-neutral everyday term in linguistics,” with various interconnected senses often used without full awareness of their distinctions. Nonetheless, this conceptual flexibility has also opened the door to its application to a wider variety of texts and linguistic phenomena, including morphological markedness in authoritative and religious texts such as the Holy Quran.

5.3. Criteria for Identifying Markedness

To systematically differentiate between unmarked and marked forms, linguists have proposed several criteria. These criteria, often independent of each other, can be morphological, semantic, and/or contextual, as indicated by Fleischman ^[10]. The present study utilizes these characteristics to analyze and evaluate the two forms:

- **Predictability:** Unmarked forms are more predictable and widely distributed. Hume ^[11] underlines their significance in differentiating between unmarked and marked forms, while Lee ^[12] links markedness to readers' expectations, noting that marked forms deviate from what is predicted, even if grammatically correct.
- **Informativeness:** Marked forms are often considered more informative than their unmarked counterparts. Winter ^[13] proposes that marked forms convey a complex informational weight and are essential to all markedness forms, displaying more information due to their restricted specificity, distribution, or complexity.
- **Frequency:** While Winter ^[13] initially considered frequency a primary factor, treating the two forms as statistically equivalent, scholars like Henning Andersen and others challenge this viewpoint, arguing that markedness cannot be resolved by frequency alone. Although important, frequency varies across languages and is shaped by factors beyond mere meaning. Winter ^[13] further highlights that markedness is intrinsically tied to productivity, complexity, informativity, and specific linguistic structures.
- **Complexity:** Often associated with frequency, complexity is another key criterion. John Haiman argues that frequency can take precedence over complexity, noting that even similarly complex words can vary in markedness due to their occurrence rates. Winter ^[13] observes that more complex elements tend to occur less frequently than simpler, unmarked forms. Edith Moravcsik emphasizes that grammatical complexity—encompassing syntax, meaning, morphology, and phonology—is vital to markedness. However, not all complex forms are necessarily marked.
- **Specification:** Roman Jakobson ^[1] introduced the notion of specification, extending Trubetzkoy's marking concept to grammatical and lexical meanings. For ex-

ample, in Russian, "oslica" (female donkey) is marked due to its gender specification, unlike the unmarked "osel" (male donkey) which lacks this specificity. He classifies specification as an essential principle for semantic markedness, drawing a parallel to the difference between "dog" (unmarked common use) and "bitch" (marked, semantic precision). Fleischman ^[10] further notes that the specificity of marked classes often leads to features such as lower frequency and less contextual usage compared to unmarked classes.

It is crucial to note that a marked form does not necessarily need to fulfill all these criteria simultaneously. This nuance is central to the present study, particularly when applying these criteria to the unique context of Quranic morphological markedness.

5.4. Markedness in Arabic Linguistics and Quranic Studies

Morphological markedness holds particular significance in Arabic linguistics due to the language's highly inflectional nature, characterized by an intricate system of morphological forms that carry precise linguistic functions and nuanced meanings. Arabic's morphology, with its complex system of affixations, roots, stems, bases, and patterns, is inherently designed to produce layers of meaning Abdul-Raof ^[30]. Within this rich context, morphological markedness plays a significant part in understanding how specific forms are employed to convey certain senses or prominences, thereby profoundly impacting interpretation. The Holy Quran, as the pinnacle of Arabic linguistic originality, is abundant in such linguistic details, going beyond usual communication Hatim ^[6]. Its morphological structures are not arbitrary; they are precisely constructed to express layers of meaning and convey moral, theological, and precise contextual notions.

Existing scholarship in Arabic linguistics has touched upon aspects related to markedness, even if not always explicitly using the term "morphological markedness." For instance, Cantarino ^[26], discusses Arabic sentence structure, arguing that marked word order is often intended "to give the predicate an emphatic effect" in nominal sentences and "to achieve an emphatic effect upon the subject" in verbal sentences. Similarly, Elimam ^[27], supported by Badawi et

al. ^[28], and David ^[29], posits that word order in Arabic is a matter of stylistic consideration, serving as a resource to achieve thematic progression, signal emphasis, and contrast, with potential effects on meaning.

Moreover, the classical Arabic linguistic tradition, notably represented by Ibn Jinni ^[31], implicitly acknowledges markedness through the principle of “زيادة المبنى تدل على زيادة المعنى” (addition in form implies addition in meaning). This concept suggests a strong correlation between any addition of letters or sounds within a word and a corresponding addition or intensification of its meaning, underscoring the intrinsic relationship between form and semantic depth in Arabic. Examples like قطع /qat'a/ (to cut) and قَطَعَ /qatt'aa/ (to cut into many pieces) clearly illustrate how a single sound addition can lead to a significant semantic extension.

Despite these insights into stylistic and semantic nuances, the current researchers observe a significant gap in the literature: there has been a dearth of studies specifically and exclusively devoted to the phenomenon of morphological markedness with Quranic verses. While general concepts of markedness have been explored, a focused examination of how specific morphological alterations at the word level impact the profound and nuanced meanings of the Quran remains unaddressed. This study aims to fill this gap, making a novel contribution to the understanding of Quranic linguistic knowledge and its intricate eloquence.

5.5. Markedness and Translation Theory (with a Focus on Authoritative Texts)

Translation, at its core, is an academic endeavor to convey meaning from a source language into a target language. However, as a “fuzzy concept,” language often renders the translator’s mission complex, if not impossible, due to inherent non-correspondences and referential gaps between languages. The process extends beyond mere semantic transfer, encompassing cultural, stylistic, and rhetorical considerations.

The challenges of translation are significantly amplified when dealing with authoritative and sacred texts like the Holy Quran. Muslim scholars have historically expressed reservations about the very concept of “Quran translation,” preferring the term “translation of the meanings of the Holy Quran.” This stance is rooted in the Quran’s unique status of linguistic inimitability (*I'jaz al-Quran*), as argued by Ab-

dul-Raof ^[7], who posits that “subtle linguistic and complex rhetorical problems remain translation resistant.” Abumahfouz and Shboul ^[8] further elaborate that due to the Quran’s distinctive linguistic nature, translators have consistently aimed to approximate its meaning rather than flawlessly simulate the original text.

It is precisely within this complex translational landscape that morphological markedness presents a significant hurdle. These nuanced alterations in the source text, being fundamental to the Quran’s inimitability and eloquence, often pose a direct challenge to translators. When marked and unmarked forms are rendered similarly in the target language, it leads to a potential translation loss of meaning and misinterpretation. The inherent subtlety and layered meaning conveyed by morphological markedness in the Quran renders the original meaning less transparent for a translator who does not recognize and actively address this linguistic phenomenon. Thus, understanding and accentuating morphological markedness is paramount ^[32] in the endeavor to accurately convey the profound meanings of the Holy Quran.

6. Findings and Discussion

In the following paragraphs, a close examination of the Quranic morphological markedness will be conducted to get a deeper understanding of the marked senses of expressions that could potentially have an extra shade of meaning because a certain linguistic entity has been added at the word level.

Roughly speaking, any morphological change, whether by addition or omission, leads to a new shade of meaning that the original expression usually does not have and cannot communicate ^[33]. Quranic morphological markedness is a special case where a particular morpheme, letter, or pair of letters is added or omitted from a certain word. This addition or deletion, at least in Quranic discourse, necessitates that the meaning of the changed expression is slightly different ^[34]. The examples below further illustrate the point under discussion:

”سَأَتَّبِعُكَ بِتَأْوِيلِ مَا لَمْ تَسْتَطِعْ عَلَيْهِ صَبْرًا“ (الآية 78 من سورة الكهف)

(Al-Khadir) said: “This is the parting between you and me, I will tell you the interpretation of (those) things over which **you were unable to hold patience**.

{Surah, 18: 78} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

He answered: This is the parting between me and thee: now will I tell thee the interpretation of (those things) over which **thou wast unable to hold patience.**

{Surah, 18: 78} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

He said: This is the parting between thee and me! I will announce unto thee the interpretation of that **thou couldst not bear with patience.**

{Surah, 18: 78} (Translated by Pickthall)

Now I will tell thee the interpretation that **thou couldst not bear patiently.**

{Surah, 18: 78} (Translated by Arberry)

”ذَلِكَ تَأْوِيلُ مَا لَمْ تَسْطِعْ عَلَيْهِ صَبْرًا“ (الآية 82 من سورة الكهف)

“That is the interpretation of those (things) over which **you could not hold patience.**”

{Surah, 18: 82} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

“Such is the interpretation of (those things) over which **thou wast unable to hold patience.**”

{Surah, 18: 82} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

“Such is the interpretation of that where with **thou couldst not bear.**”

{Surah, 18: 82} (Translated by Pickthall)

This is the interpretation of that **thou couldst not bear patiently.**

{Surah, 18: 82} (Translated by Arberry)

The words “تسطيع” and “تستطيع” are two realizations of the same word with the letter “ت” skipped in example (2), similar to morpheme/allomorph and phoneme/allophone. Each time one reads the Ayah, the word “تسطيع” attracts the attention of the reader. The use of the word in its less common or marked form is intended. Furthermore, the peculiar usage requires the translator to find a way to convey the meaning. However, the translators of the meanings of the Holy Quran, as shown above, manage them differently. Ibn Ashur^[16], argues that Quranic discourse uses the more common form (unmarked) “تستطيع” first, and then uses the second, “lighter” word to avoid repetition.

Pickthall^[17], Ali^[19], and Arberry^[18], on the one hand, provide a single translation for the two expressions choosing, intentionally or unintentionally, not to address the slight difference between them.

On the other hand, Hilali and Khan^[21] and Pickthall^[17] are aware of the slight but important difference in meaning between the terms in question. Hilali and Khan use “unable” as an equivalent to “تستطيع” and “could not”, which is

equivalent to “تسطيع”. However, the difference between the two expressions in Arabic is morphological whereas the difference between their English equivalents, as used by Hilali and Khan, is lexical. In Arabic, the word “تستطيع” is the unmarked one but Hilali and Khan use, as its equivalent, “unable” which is the marked expression. They also use “could not” which is the unmarked expression in English as an equivalent to “تسطيع” which is the marked one.

Suggested translation for Example (1):

“This is the parting between me and you; I will tell you the interpretation of the things which you **could not** bear patiently.”

Suggested translation for Example (2):

“That is the interpretation of the things which you were **unable** to bear patiently.”

Sometimes the morphological variation is not always intended merely to avoid just repetition as in (1) and (2) above. There is more to the use of the two expressions—one marked and the other unmarked—goes beyond matters of style.

Synonyms with Nuanced Meanings

Al-Zamakhshari^[35], in his book *Al-Kashshaf*, states that the Holy Quran usually utilizes synonyms to express delicate distinctions, as in “استطاع” and “استطاع”.

”فَمَا اسْتَطَاعُوا أَنْ يَظْهَرُوهُ وَمَا اسْتَطَاعُوا لَهُ نَقْبًا“ (الآية 97 من سورة الكهف)

So, **they (Gog and Magog) could not scale it or dig through it.**

{Surah, 18: 97} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

Thus, were **they made powerless to scale it or to dig through it?**

{Surah, 18: 97} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

And **(Gog and Magog) were not able to surmount, nor could they pierce (it).**

{Surah, 18: 97} (Translated by Pickthall)

So, **they were unable either to scale it or pierce it.**

{Surah, 18: 97} (Translated by Arberry)

Unlike examples (1) and (2) above where the more common form (unmarked) is mentioned first and the less common form (marked) is mentioned after it to avoid repetition, in (3) above it is vice versa, i.e., the less common form “استطاعوا” is mentioned first and the more common one “استطاعوا” is mentioned last. This is to emphasize that there is more to the use of the marked form than just avoiding repetition. Additionally, “استطاعوا” and “استطاعوا” are em-

ployed in the Holy Quran as instances of phonetic economy, where sound mirrors effort ^[16].

Ibn Ashur ^[16] puts forward that resorting to a verb with an addition in form leads to an addition in meaning because being able to dig through the dam is harder than being able to climb it. In other words, the weaker form of the verb, which is “اسطاعوا”, (to climb) is used for climbing a dam that is supposedly slippery because it is coated with a layer that is made of molten copper. Physical strength does not belong here. The term “اسطاعوا” thus highlights the eloquence and inimitability of the Holy Quran ^[16]. However, the stronger form, which is “استطاعوا”, (digging) is used in the context of talking about making breaching a dam made of red-hot blocks of iron that will be covered with molten copper. The stronger form is used to describe a situation that needs extreme physical strength, and the weaker form is used to describe the situation that does not need extreme physical strength. Overall, morphological markedness, and the difference in meaning resulting from it, can often be attributed to some grammatical variations. For instance, in Arabic, to form the plural regularly for masculine nouns, the suffix /ūn/ is added to the singular nouns in the nominative case. In the accusative case the /ūn/ is changed into / ī: n/. Feminine nouns, however, are regularly formed by adding the suffix /āt/. This unmarked rule is not followed in all plurals. The so-called broken plurals or /jam at-takṣīr/ do not adhere to a single pattern and must be memorized for each group of words. The regular plural refers to fewer numbers than the broken plural. The following examples further illustrate the idea:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّينَ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ وَيَقْتُلُونَ الَّذِينَ
يَأْمُرُونَ بِالْقِسْطِ مِنَ النَّاسِ فَبَشِّرْهُمْ بِعَذَابٍ أَلِيمٍ
(الآية 21 من سورة آل عمران)

Verily, those who disbelieve in the Ayat (proofs, evidence, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of Allah, and kill **the Prophets without right**, and kill those men who order just dealings, - then announce to them a painful torment.

{Surah, 3: 21} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

As for those who deny the Signs of Allah and, **in defiance of right, slay the Prophets**, and slay those who teach just dealing with humankind, announce to them a grievous chastisement.

{Surah, 3: 21} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

Lo! Those who disbelieve the revelations of Allah, **slay**

the Prophets wrongfully, and slay those among humankind who enjoin equity: promise them a painful doom.

{Surah, 3: 21} (Translated by Pickthall)

ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ الْأَنْبِيَاءَ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ ذَٰلِكَ بِمَا
“عَصَوْا وَكَانُوا يَعْتَدُونَ”
(الآية 112 من سورة آل عمران)

This is because they disbelieved in the Ayat (proofs, evidence, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of Allah and killed the Prophets without right. It is also because they disobeyed Allah and used to transgress beyond bounds (in Allah’s disobedience, crime, and sins).

Ibn Katheer ^[15] states that “النبيين” in the verse highlights decency, closeness, or distinct relations. It describes the position of the prophets or their relationship with believers, while “الأنبياء” is further generic and is utilized to depict prophets jointly or in stories. The choice of the two expressions echoes the delicate nuances of the message in the two verses.

{Surah, 3: 112} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

This is because they ejected the Signs of Allah and slew **the Prophets in defiance of right**: this is because they rebelled and transgressed beyond bounds.

{Surah, 3: 112} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

That is because they used to disbelieve the revelations of Allah and slew **the Prophets wrongfully**. That is because they were rebellious and used to transgress.

{Surah, 3: 112} (Translated by Pickthall)

Seemingly, to bridge the gap resulting from the potential difference in meaning between the regular plural, as in (4) above, and the broken plural as in (5) above, the quantifier “a lot of” can be added to make the reader realize that there is a slight difference between using the “plural of few” and “plural of many”.

Ibn Katheer ^[15] states that “النبيين” in the verse highlights decency, closeness, or distinct relations. It describes the position of the prophets or their relationship with believers, while “الأنبياء” is further generic and is utilized to depict prophets jointly or in stories. The choice of the two expressions echoes the delicate nuances of the message in the two verses.

Suggested translation:

That is because they disbelieved in the Ayat (proofs, evidence, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of Allah and killed **a lot of Prophets in defiance of right**. That is

because they disobeyed Allah and used to transgress.

ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّينَ بِغَيْرِ الْحَقِّ ذَلِكَ بِمَا عَصَوْا وَكَانُوا يَعْتَدُونَ
(البقرة الآية 61)

That is because they disbelieved in the Ayat (proofs, evidence, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of Allah and killed the Prophets wrongfully. That was because they disobeyed and used to transgress beyond the bounds (in disobedience to Allah, i.e., commit crimes and sins).

{Surah, 2: 61} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

This is because they rejected the Signs of Allah and slaying His Messengers without just cause. This is because they rebelled and transgressed continually.

{Surah, 2: 61} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

That is because they disbelieved in Allah's revelations and slew the Prophets wrongfully. That was for their disobedience and transgression.

{Surah, 2: 61} (Translated by Pickthall)

In some cases, morphological markedness reveals itself in the form of addition not subtraction as in (1,2, and 3) above. This morphological representation of the presented word must be reflected in its meaning. Furthermore, the first Arab linguist to address this issue was Ibn Jinni^[31] who suggested a strong correlation between any addition of letters or sounds and the addition of meaning since speech sounds are intrinsically related to meaning. The meaning becomes stronger whenever we use a strong sound and vice versa. For example, قطع /qat'a/ means "to cut", and قَطَعَ /qatt'aa/ means "to cut into many pieces." Hence, the addition of a single sound or letter to the word leads to a clear addition of meaning. Such meaning, however, must be reflected in the translation process. Examples of this phenomenon are ubiquitous in the Holy Quran. Consider the following examples:

Wälchli^[25] suggests that markedness is a deviation from the norm, a deviation from the expected. In other words, the rarity or peculiarity of a certain text has a special meaning that must be heeded because it not only attracts the attention of the audience, but it also has a new meaning in its peculiarity. However, because there is no one-to-one correspondence between languages, losing some aspects of the meaning resulting from the markedness or rarity of texts seems inevitable in the Quranic discourse. The following examples illustrate How Quranic textual markedness can pose a problem for translators of the meanings of the Holy

Qur'an:

قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (72) الكهف

He (Al-Khadr) said, "Did I not tell you, that you would not be able to have patience with me?"

{Surah, 18: 72} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

He answered, "Did I not tell thee that thou canst have no patience with me?"

{Surah, 18: 72} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

He said: Did I not tell thee thou couldst not bear with me?

{Surah, 18: 72} (Translated by Pickthall)

He said, "Did I not say that thou couldst never bear with me patiently?"

{Surah, 18: 72} (Translated by Arberry)

قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ لَنْ تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا (75) الكهف

He (Al-Khadr) said, "Did I not tell you that you can have no patience with me?"

{Surah, 18: 75} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

He answered, "Did I not tell thee that thou canst have no patience with me?"

{Surah, 18: 75} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

He said, "Did I not tell thee thou couldst not bear with me?"

{Surah, 18: 75} (Translated by Pickthall)

He said, "Did I not say that thou couldst never bear with me patiently?"

{Surah, 18: 75} (Translated by Arberry)

The difference between (8) and (9) above is in the addition of the expression (لَكَ) /laka/. This addition emphasizes the idea inherent in the previous verse (8). Ibn Ashur^[16] puts forward that (لَكَ) /laka/ is used because Moses failed to abide by Al-khader's instructions. In a situation where you tell someone, over whom you have authority to do a certain thing, and he/she does not do it, you find yourself obliged to repeat your order in a stronger tone for the second time. Al-khadher told Moses that he would not endure what he would experience with him. The agreement between them was that Moses would not ask a question about what he saw until Al-Kader explained it to him. The following translation could be a possible way to bridge the slight gap between the two verses:

He said, "Did I not repeatedly tell you that you can have no patience with me?"

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا (136) البقرة

Say (O Muslims), “We believe in Allah and that which has been sent down to us.”

{Surah, 2: 136} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

Say ye, “We believe in Allah and the revelation given to us.”

{Surah, 2: 136} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

Say (O Muslims): We believe in Allah and that which is revealed unto us.”

{Surah, 2: 136} (Translated by Pickthall)

قُلْ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ عَلَيْنَا (84) ال عمران

Say (O Muhammad), “We believe in Allah and that which has been sent down to us.”

{Surah, 3: 84} (Translated by Hilali and Khan)

Say, “We believe in Allah, and in what has been revealed to us.”

{Surah, 3: 84} (Translated by Abdullah Ali)

Say (O Muhammad), We believe in Allah and that which is revealed unto us.”

{Surah, 3: 84} (Translated by Pickthall)

Ibn Ashur ^[16] proposes that the verb “أنزل” (descend) is associated with the preposition “على” because descending necessitates “highness” of the thing descended. Thus, the descended thing came from above, from a high place. On the other hand, in Chapter (2), Verse 138, the same verb is associated with the preposition “إلى” (to) because the descending process implies the outreach. **Table A1** in the appendix provides more examples of morphological markedness in terms of marked and unmarked forms.

6.1. Markedness in Verbal Forms (Omission/Addition of Letters)

6.1.1. Nuances of Ability: تستطع vs. تسطع (Al-Kahf 18:78 & 18:82)

The Quran uses “تستطع” (unmarked) followed by “تسطع” (marked, with the omitted ‘ت’) to subtly differentiate levels of inability. Ibn Ashur ^[16] notes “تسطع” is “lighter,” possibly implying quicker action or lesser difficulty.

- **Translation Critique:** Many English translations neutralize this distinction (e.g., rendering both forms as “unable”). Some differentiate lexically but often invert the markedness (e.g., using “unable” for unmarked “تستطع”). This leads to meaning loss.
- **Suggested Improvement:** Convey the specific nu-

ance: “could not bear patiently” for “تستطع” and “were unable to bear patiently” for “تسطع.”

6.1.2. Gradations of Effort: استطاعوا vs. اسطاعوا (Al-Kahf 18 : 97)

Here, the marked form «استطاعوا» appears before the unmarked form «استطاعوا». Ibn Ashur ^[16] explains this reflects differing effort: “استطاعوا” (lighter form) for climbing (less effort), and “استطاعوا” (stronger form) for digging (greater effort).

- **Translation Critique:** Most translations homogenize these forms, losing the crucial distinction between levels of strenuousness.
- **Suggested Improvement:** Differentiate effort, e.g., “unable to scale it” and “could not manage to pierce it.”

6.2. Markedness in Nominal Forms (Plural Variations)

Specificity and Generality: الأنبياء vs. النبيين (Ali Imran 3:21, 3:112; Al-Baqarah 2:61)

Arabic uses “النبيين” (regular plural) for a specific or smaller group of prophets, and “الأنبياء” (broken plural) for a more general or larger multitude. Ibn Katheer ^[15] highlights this distinction in specificity and generality.

- **Translation Critique:** English translations universally render both as “the Prophets,” thereby obscuring the subtle numerical/specificity difference.
- **Suggested Improvement:** Use “the Prophets” for “النبيين” and “a great number of Prophets” or “many Prophets” for “الأنبياء” to retain this nuance.

6.3. Markedness through Letter Omission and Phonetic Economy

This section explores instances where the omission of a letter from a morphological form signals a specific nuance or rhetorical purpose, often related to concepts of ‘lightness’ or a subtle shift in ability/effort (**Table 1**).

6.4. Markedness through Morphological Pattern Shifts and Plural Forms

This section examines how variations in word patterns or the choice between regular and irregular plural forms

convey distinct semantic and rhetorical nuances, often related to quantity, specificity, or generality. An example is the “broken plural” (*jam’ at-taksīr*), which refers to irregular plural forms in Arabic that do not follow a standard suffixation rule, unlike regular plurals (Table 2).

6.5. Markedness through Letter/Morpheme Addition and Intensification

This section explores how the addition of letters or spe-

cific morphological patterns (e.g., “gemination” — *tashdid*, the doubling of a consonant; or the use of derived verbal forms like Form II — *fa’ala* for intensification, or Form X — *istaf’ala* for seeking/requesting) fundamentally alters or intensifies the meaning of the base word, a principle rooted in classical Arabic linguistics such as Ibn Jinni’s “زيادة المعنى المبني تدل على زيادة المعنى” (addition in form implies addition in meaning) (Table 3).

Table 1. Morphological Markedness via Letter Omission (تسطع / تستطع).

Surah: Verse	Arabic Key Phrase (Transliteration)	Morphological Form	Key Nuance (Brief)	Hilali & Khan Translation	Abdullah Yusuf Ali Translation	Pickthall Translation
18:78	مَا لَمْ تَسْتَطِعْ (tastati‘)	Unmarked (Form X)	Standard Ability	unable to hold patience	unable to hold patience	couldst not bear with patience
18:82	مَا لَمْ تَسْطِعْ (tasti‘)	Marked (Omission)	Lighter/Subtle	could not hold patience	unable to hold patience	couldst not bear
18:97	فَمَا اسْتَطَاعُوا (istā‘ū)	Marked (Omission)	Effortless Climbing	could not scale it	made powerless to scale it	we’re not able to surmount
18:97	وَمَا اسْتَطَاعُوا (istaṭā‘ū)	Unmarked (Form X)	Extreme Digging	or dig through it	or to dig through it	nor could they pierce (it)

Table 2. Morphological Markedness via Plural Form Variation (النبيين / الأنبياء).

Surah: Verse	Arabic Key Phrase (Transliteration)	Plural Type	Key Nuance (Brief)	Hilali & Khan Translation	Abdullah Yusuf Ali Translation	Pickthall Translation
3:21	يَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّنَ (an-nabiyyīn)	Regular/Few	Specific/Close	kill the prophets	slay the prophets	slay the prophets
3:112	وَيَقْتُلُونَ الْأَنْبِيَاءَ (al-anbiyā’)	Broken/Many	Generic/Multitude	killed the prophets	slew the prophets	slew the prophets
2:61	وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيِّنَ (an-nabiyyīn)	Regular/Few	Specific/Known	killed the prophets	slaying his messengers	slew the prophets

Table 3. Morphological Markedness via Letter/Morpheme Addition (Intensification).

Surah: Verse	Arabic Key Phrase (Transliteration)	Morphological Change	Key Nuance (Brief)	Abdullah Yusuf Ali Translation	Proposed Strategy (Example)
2:261	وَاللَّهُ يُضَاعِفُ (yuḍā‘ifu)	Form II (Gemination)	Manifold Increase	Allah doth increase manifold	Allah multiplies manifold
7:154	وَلَمَّا سَكَتَ (sakatta)	Form I	To be silent	When Musa’s anger was appeased	When Musa’s rage completely subsided
7:154	يَرْهَبُونَ (yarhabūna)	Form I	To fear	such as fear their Lord	such as are in profound awe of their Lord
2:262	لَنْ يَنْبَغُونَ (yuṭbi‘ūna)	Form IV	To cause to follow	follow not up their gifts	do not let follow up their charities

6.6. Broader Implications

Quranic morphological markedness profoundly contributes to its eloquence and inimitability. When translators fail to capture these nuanced forms, this results in meaning loss and potential misinterpretation. Recognizing and accurately conveying this markedness is paramount for a faithful rendering of the Quran's intricate messages.

7. Conclusions

Quranic morphological markedness serves as a linguistic tool that strengthens the exact meanings of the verses and enhances their overall effect. It highlights linguistic complexity and illustrates how Quranic verses are densely loaded with profound meanings, eloquence, and inimitability. It enhances the distinctiveness of the linguistic aesthetics and the depth of the Quranic verses. Marked forms convey additional senses, complexity, and clarity in meaning compared to unmarked forms. Quranic morphological markedness of marked forms, including specific prefixes, infixes, and suffixes, can influence the interpretation of verses by highlighting particular aspects of their meaning. These morphological affixes carry nuanced meanings that can enhance the understanding of verses, especially those with religious or theoretical significance, by providing more precise interpretations [20,36]. It displays the dynamic association between form and meaning reflecting the richness and accuracy of Arabic, in the Quranic verses, in which marked forms convey rhetorical, spiritual, and linguistic meaning. Quranic morphological markedness is a linguistic phenomenon that permeates the entire Quranic text and poses a considerable obstacle for translators of the Holy Quran, causing a loss in translation. Quranic morphological markedness is a linguistic phenomenon throughout the Quranic text, posing a significant challenge for translators of the Holy Quran and often leading to a loss in translation. Translators typically render both marked and unmarked forms similarly, often oblivious to the different interpretations of the two forms, thereby creating a mis-translation of the forms. In brief, the investigation of Quranic morphological markedness offers valued insights into the linguistic details of the Holy Quran through scrutinizing unmarked and marked forms that reveal the layers of senses embedded in the Quranic verses and enhance the perception of its godly message. This study contributes to all disciplines of linguistics and enhances the awareness of the Holy Quran

as a linguistic and elevated value by revealing how linguistic features contribute to a deeper understanding of the Quran's heavenly message and its elaborate layers of meaning. It offers valued insights into the linguistic richness of the Quranic verses and stresses the importance of morphological markedness in translation. Future research could further enhance this study's interdisciplinary depth by exploring the psycholinguistic processing of Quranic morphological markedness, examining its cognitive impact on native speakers' comprehension and memory. Additionally, deeper engagement with advanced methods in Islamic exegesis could provide more nuanced insights into the divine intent and rhetorical functions behind specific morphological choices [37].

Author Contributions

O.A.A.-H.E. was responsible for writing the introduction, literature review writing down the methods of the research, and analyzing the data. A.W.M. was assigned to follow up with the participants, write the conclusion, and ensure that the article meets the guidelines of the journal in addition to all correspondence about the manuscript. A.M.A. was assigned to prepare the outline of the manuscript the editing of the manuscript. A.A.N. was assigned to analyze the data based on the verses and suggested implications and proofread the whole manuscript. A.S. collected the data from the *Holy Quran* and classified them. A.A.J. analyzed the verses in terms of unmarked and marked forms and their interpretations. A.A.K. reviewed the whole Verses, double-checked their interpretations, and compared the translations of the scholars. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the Deanship General Education and Foundation Program Rabdan Academy, Abu Dhabi, UAE.

Institutional Review Board Statement

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of Program Rabdan Academy(protocol code 56422-April.2025).

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the study's findings are available by Dr. Omar Abdullah Al-HAJ Eid upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express gratitude to **Dr. Majdi Sulaim-**

an Jaber (Assistant Professor of Quranic Interpretation) for constant support, insightful guidance in providing us with the necessary data and reviewing the Quranic verses throughout this article.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

Appendix A

Table A1. More examples of morphological markedness.

Translation	Marked Phonemic Transcription	Unmarked Phonemic Transcription	Unmarked Quranic Expression	Marked Quranic Expression	Surah & Verse
Could/were able to	taṣṭīʿ	taṣṭaṭīʿ	تَسْتَطِيعُ	تَسْتَطِيعُ	سورة الكهف: 28 سورة الكهف: 87
Could/were able to	iṣṭāʿū	iṣṭaṭāʿū	اسْتَطَاعُوا	اسْتَطَاعُوا	سورة الكهف: 79 سورة الكهف: 79
Very clear	mubayyinātin	bayyināt	بَيِّنَات	مُبَيِّنَات	سورة الطلاق: 11 سورة البقرة: 100
A limited amount/ number	maʿdūdatan	maʿdūdātin	مَعْدُودَات	مَعْدُودَةٌ	سورة البقرة: 08 سورة آل عمران: 42
Innocent	barāʿun	barīʿun	بَرَاءٌ	بَرِيءٌ	سورة الانعام: 91 سورة الزخرف: 62
Overtaken into	fakubbat	fakubkibū	فَكُبِّبُوا	فَكُبِّبْتُ	سورة النمل: 09 سورة الشعراء: 49
Sent down	anzala	nazzala	نَزَّلَ	أَنْزَلَ	سورة آل عمران: 7 سورة آل عمران: 3
We sent down	nzalnā	anzalnā	نَزَّلْنَا	أَنْزَلْنَا	سورة العنكبوت: 15 سورة النحل: 98
Haſten towards it	yaṣṭaʿjilu minhu	yaṣṭaʿjilu bihā	يَسْتَعْجِلُ بِهَا	يَسْتَعْجِلُ مِنْهُ	سورة يونس: 05 سورة الشورى: 81
Here you are, those .who	hā antum hāulāʿi	hā antum ulāʿi	هَ أَنْتُمْ أَوْلَآءَ	هَ أَنْتُمْ هَؤُلَآءَ	سورة آل عمران: 66 سورة آل عمران: 119
Has come to you	jāʿakum	jāʿatkumu	جَاءَكُمْ	جَاءَكُمْ	سورة آل عمران: 157 سورة الاعراف: 58
which has been sent down to us	unzila ʿalā	unzila ʿalaynā	أُنْزِلَ عَلَيْنَا	أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا	سورة آل عمران: 48 سورة البقرة: 136
A magician	sāḥir	saḥḥār	سَاحِر	سَحَار	سورة الشعراء: 73 سورة ص: 4
You died	mittam	muttam	مُتَم	مِتَم	سورة المؤمنون: 53 سورة آل عمران: 851
Their prayers	ṣalawātihim	ṣalātihim	صَلَاتِهِمْ	صَلَّوَاتِهِمْ	المؤمنون: 9 الأنعام: 29
Blessing or favor	naʿmatin	niʿmatin	نِعْمَةٍ	نَعْمَةٍ	الدخان: 72 النحل: 35
Those who are warned or given warning	al-munzarīn	al-munzirīn	الْمُنْذَرِينَ	الْمُنْذِرِينَ	النمل: 29 الشعراء: 371

Table A1. Cont.

Translation	Marked Phonemic Transcription	Unmarked Phonemic Transcription	Unmarked Quranic Expression	Marked Quranic Expression	Surah & Verse
Mercy	raḥmata	raḥmah	رَحْمَةً	رَحْمَتٌ	الزخرف: 23 آل عمران: 8
Kindness or goodness	iḥsānan	ḥasanan	حَسَنًا	إِحْسَانًا	الأحقاف: 51 المائدة: 21
Grateful or thankful	shākīr	shakūr	شَكُورٍ	شَاكِرٌ	البقرة: 851 إبراهيم: 5
He remembers or he is reminded	yaḍḍakkaru	yataḍakkaru	يَذْكُرُ	يَذْكُرُ	البقرة: 962 الفجر: 32
Similar	mushtabihan	mutashābihan	مُتَشَابِهًا	مُتَشَبِّهًا	الأنعام: 99 البقرة: 52
unjust	ẓalūm	alẓālim	الظَّالِمِ	ظُلُومٌ	إبراهيم: 43 النساء: 57
I will kill you	la-aqtulannaka	liaqtulaka	لَأَقْتُلَنَّكَ	لَأَقْتُلَنَّكَ	سورة المائدة: 72 سورة المائدة: 82
Argued	ḥājjaj	ḥājja	حَاجَّ	حَاجَجٌ	آل عمران: 66 البقرة: 852
Saved	anjaynā	najjaynā	نَجَّيْنَا	أَنْجَيْنَا	الشعراء: 56 القمر: 43
Give a delay	amhil	mahhil	مَهَّلْ	أَمْهَلْ	الطارق: 71 المزمل: 11
They deceive	yukhādi‘ūn	yakhda‘ūn	يُخَدِّعُونَ	يُخَادِعُونَ	البقرة: 01 البقرة: 9
What have earned or gained	iktasabat	kasabat	كَسَبَتْ	اِكْتَسَبَتْ	البقرة: 682 البقرة: 682
Be patient	iṣṭabir	iṣbir	اصْبِرْ	اصْطَبِرْ	مريم: 56 هود: 511
Hear nothing	yassamma‘u	yasma‘u	لَا يَسْمَعُ	لَا يَسْمَعُ	الصافات: 8 البقرة: 171
Whoever opposes	yuhādīd	yuhāddu	يُحَادِّدُ	يُحَادِدِدُ	التوبة: 36 المجادلة: 5
excellent	ni‘immā	ni‘ma	نِعْمٌ	نِعِمًا	سورة النساء: 85 سورة الانفال: 04
Take their souls or cause to die	tawaffāhumu	tatawaffāhumu	تَتَوَفَّاهُمْ اَل	تَوَفَّاهُمْ	سورة النساء: 79 سورة النحل: 23
Greeting or state of peace	salām	salāman	سَلَامًا	سَلَامٌ	سورة النحل: 23 سورة الذاريات: 52
Knowledgeable	‘allām	‘alīm	عَلِيمٌ	عَلَامٌ	المائدة: 5 البقرة: 59
Thus, for you or in this manner for you	kadhālikum	kadhālika	كَذَلِكَ	كَذَلِكُمْ	سورة الفتح: 51 سورة البقرة: 37
forgiver	ghāfir	ghaffār	غَفَّارٌ	غَافِرٌ	سورة غافر: 3 طه: 28
Sent among you	arsalnā fikum	arsalnā ilaykum	ارسلنا إِلَيْكُمْ	ارسلنا فِيكُمْ	سورة البقرة: 150 سورة المزمل: 51
Sent among them	wa-ib‘ath fiḥim	ba‘atha fiḥim	بَعَثْ فِيهِمْ	وَابْعَثْ فِيهِمْ	سورة البقرة: 129 سورة البقرة: 164
They hasten for it	yaṣṭa‘jilu minhu	yaṣṭa‘jilu bihā	يَسْتَعْجِلُ بِهَا	يَسْتَعْجِلُ مِنْهُ	سورة يونس: 05 سورة الشورى: 81
Who opposed	wa-man yushāqq	wa-man yushāqiq	وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقْ	وَمَنْ يُشَاقِّ	سورة الحشر: 4 سورة الانفال: 31
Children or sons	banūn	abnā’	أَبْنَاءٌ	بَنُونَ	الشعراء: 88 سورة النور: 13
Saves or delivers	yunjī	yunajjī	يُنَجِّي	يُنْجِي	المعارج: 41 الزمر: 16

Table A1. *Cont.*

Translation	Marked Phonemic Transcription	Unmarked Phonemic Transcription	Unmarked Quranic Expression	Marked Quranic Expression	Surah & Verse
Changes or substitutes	yubdila	yubaddilu	يُبَدِّلُ	يُبَدِّلُ	الكهف: 18 البقرة: 181
Ask	yatasā' alūn		يَسْأَلُونَ	يَسْأَلُونَ	المؤمنون: 101 البقرة: 981
Prolong/extend or support	yamduḍ	yamuḍdu	يَمُدُّ	يَمُدُّ	مريم: 57 الأعراف: 202
Touch	tamsas	tamsas	تَمَسَّ	تَمَسَّ	آل عمران: 201 هود: 311
Enjoying or rejoicing	fakihīn	fākihīn	فَاكِهِيْنَ	فَكِهِيْنَ	المطففين: 13 الدخان: 72
We sent down to you the Book	Anzalnā ilayka	Anzalnā ayka	إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ	إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ	سورة الزمر: 14 سورة النساء: 501
Never be among doubters	takun mina l-mumtarīn	takūnanna mina mumtarīn	فَلَا تَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْمُتَرَتِّبِينَ	لَا تَكُنْ مِنَ الْمُتَرَتِّبِينَ	سورة آل عمران: 60 سورة البقرة: 741
Tradition or way	sunnat	sunnah	سُنَّةٌ	سُنَّتٌ	الأنفال: 83 الحجر: 31
Said	qālat	qāla	قَالَتْ	قَالَتْ	سورة الحجرات: 41 سورة يوسف: 03
Prophets/ messengers	an-nabiyyin	anbiyaa	الْأَنْبِيَاءَ	الْأَنْبِيَاءِ	سورة آل عمران: 112 & 21
Did I not tell you	?al-mu ?agal ?an-ik	?al-mu ?agal lak	أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ	أَلَمْ أَقُلْ لَكَ إِنَّكَ	سورة الكهف: 75 & 72
The one who might be purified	yatazakkā	yazzakkā	يَزَكِّي	يَزَكِّي	الليل: 81 عبس: 3

References

- [1] Jakobson, R., 1941. Child Language, Aphasia and General Sound Laws. Almqvist & Wiksell: Uppsala, Sweden. (in German)
- [2] Alenazy, M.A., Almahameed, Y.S., Tawalbeh, A.I., et al., 2024. Arabic profession-denoting nouns and gender: A morphosyntactic analysis of agreement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 14(12), 3733–3743. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1412.07>
- [3] Trask, R.L., 1993. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [4] Battistella, E., 1996. *The Logic of Markedness*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- [5] Abumahfouz, A., 2011. Some issues in translating nouns in Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation of the meanings of the Holy Quran. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature*. 3(1), 65–83.
- [6] Hatim, B., 2004. The translation of style: linguistic markedness and textual evaluativeness. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 1(3), 229–246. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/japl.2004.1.3.229>
- [7] Abdul-Raof, H., 2001. *Qur'an translation Discourse, Texture, And Exegesis*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [8] Abumahfouz, A., Al-Shboul, Y., 2020. Qur'anic Semantic Markedness: A Translation and Linguistic Perspective. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 47(1). Available from: <https://archives.ju.edu.jo/index.php/hum/article/view/102715> (cited 28 March 2025).
- [9] Levinson, S., 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [10] Fleischman, S., 1990. *Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*. University of Texas Press: Austin, TX, USA.
- [11] Hume, E., 2005. Markedness: A predictability-based approach. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, BLS 30: General Session and Parasession on Conceptual Structure and Cognition in Grammatical Theory*, Berkeley, CA, USA, 13–16 February 2004; pp.182–198. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v30i1.948>
- [12] Lee, T., 2017. *Applied Translation Studies*. Bloomsbury Academic: London, UK.
- [13] Winter, W., 1989. Markedness and naturalness. In: Tomic, O.M., (ed.). *Markedness in Synchrony and Diachrony*. pp. 103–109. Walter de Gruyter & Co: Berlin, Germany.
- [14] Khasawneh, R.R., Moindjie, M.A., Kasuma, S.A.A., 2025. Diachronic translation of figures of speech in Antara's Mu'allaqā. *World Journal of English Language*. 15(3), 290. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n3p290>

- [15] Ibn Katheer, I.B., 1998. *Tafseer al-Quran al-'Azeem*. Maktabat Dar Al-Faiha: Damascus, Syria. (in Arabic)
- [16] Ibn Ashur, M., 1973. *At-Tahrir wa at-Tanwir*. Dar ibn Hazm: Beirut, Lebanon. (in Arabic)
- [17] Pickthall, M., 2001. *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*. Universal Book Stall: New Delhi, India.
- [18] Arberry, A.J., 1996. *The Koran Interpreted: A Translation*. Touchstone: New York, NY, USA.
- [19] Ali, A., 2022. *The Holy Quran*. Dār Al-‘Arabia: Beirut, Lebanon. (in Arabic)
- [20] Abdel, H.M., 2004. *The Qur'an: A New Translation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- [21] Hilali, M.T., Khan, M.M., 1996. *The Noble Qur'an: English translation of the meanings and commentary*. King Fahd Complex for Printing of The Holy Qur'an: Madinah Munawwarah, KSA.
- [22] Trubetzkoy, N.S., 1939. *Basics of Phonology*, Vol. 6. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague: Prague, Czechoslovakia. (in German).
- [23] Haspelmath, M., 2005. Against markedness (and what to replace it with). *Journal of Linguistics*. 42, 25–70. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003683>
- [24] Suastini, N., 2018. Translation and markedness. *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies*. 6(4), 28. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.6n.4p.28>
- [25] Walchli, B., 2005. *Co-compounds and Natural Coordination*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- [26] Cantarino, V., 1974. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose, Volume 1: The Simple Sentence*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, IN, USA.
- [27] Elimmam, S., 2013. *Marked Word Order in the Qur'an and its English Translations: Patterns and Motivations*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Cambridge, UK.
- [28] Badawi, E.-S., Carter, M.G., Gully, A., 2004. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [29] David, K., 1995. Word order variation in Arabic. *Journal of Linguistics* 31 (1):40–70.
- [30] Abdul-Raof, H., 1999. Untranslatability of semantically oriented Qur'anic syntax. *Offshoot: A Journal of Translation and Comparative Studies*. 2(2), 39–46. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i6.6497>
- [31] Ibn Jinni, A., 1986. *Al-Muhtasib*. Dar Sirkeen LilTiba'a Wanashir: Beirut, Lebanon. (in Arabic)
- [32] Saleh, B.M.Y., 2025. Linguistic development in the perspective of modern linguistics – an applied theoretical study. *Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Journal for Human and Social Studies*. 6(2).
- [33] Sibawayh, 1988. *Al-Kitab*. Maktabat al-Khanji: Cairo, Egypt. (in Arabic)
- [34] Rababah, A.A.H., Obaidat, M.M., 2024. Declarations speech acts in the discourse directed to believers in the Holy Qur'an: A pragmatic study. *Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Journal for Human and Social Studies*. 5(2).
- [35] Al-Zamakhshari, M., 2006. *Al-Kashshaf*. Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmyah: Beirut, Lebanon. (in Arabic)
- [36] Khan, G., 2000. *The Early Quranic Codices*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [37] Abdul Hay, A.W.S., 2024. The problem of transferring new concepts of prospective studies and globalization into Arabic. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 51(2), 296–311.